

Remarks

The Applicants have amended Claims 1, 2, 7 and 8 in a number of locations to rearrange some of the language and clarify some of the relationships between various ones of the components. Entry into the official file and consideration on the merits is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 stands objected to with respect to the arrangement of the formulae. The formulae have accordingly been moved to the end of the claim in accordance to the Examiner's helpful suggestion.

Claim 8 has been amended in accordance with the Examiner's helpful suggestion with respect to the objection to that claim.

Withdrawal of the objections to Claims 1 and 8 is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-2, 4-5 and 7-8 stand rejected under 35 USC §112 as being indefinite. The Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's helpful comments with respect to each of Claims 1, 2, 7 and 8. Those claims have been amended as helpfully suggested by the Examiner. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-2 stand rejected under 35 USC §102 as being anticipated by Rauchfuss. The Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's detailed comments hypothetically applying Rauchfuss against those claims. The Applicants nonetheless respectfully submit that Rauchfuss fails to explicitly or implicitly disclose all of the subject matter of those two claims. Details follow.

Referring to Fig. 4 of Rauchfuss, the Applicants' angles α , β are supposed to be as shown in the enclosed Fig. 1, namely:

- (1) When aiming at the roller 40, α is about 70° and β is almost in parallel ($\beta \doteq 0^\circ$) with the rotating shaft of the supporting member and accordingly, the relationship of $\alpha < \beta$ and $\alpha + \beta < 180^\circ$ is not realized.
- (2) When aiming at the roller 30, α is almost in parallel ($\alpha \doteq 0^\circ$) with the rotating shaft of the supporting member and β is about 70° and, accordingly, the relationship of $\alpha < \beta$ and $\alpha + \beta < 180^\circ$ is realized.

According to the principle shown in the enclosed Fig. 2, the Applicants' yarn path guide is guided in an original yarn path direction by a guide roll that is rotated by tension of yarns around the rotating shaft of the supporting member. (This Fig. 2 is the same as Fig. A attached to the Remarks of March 30, 2009.)

The reference symbols in enclosed Fig. 2 represent the following, and the moment M to incline the guide roll is formulated as follows:

$$M = \Delta x T (-\sin \alpha + \sin \beta), \text{ wherein}$$

α : angle between the rotating shaft direction of supporting member and the yarn path entering the guide roll

β : angle between the rotating shaft direction of supporting member and the yarn path coming out the guide roll

Δx : Variation amount of yarn path

T: tension

M: Moment to incline the guide roll

When viewing the roller 30 and roller 40 separately in Rauchfuss, the guide roller 30 is rotated around the rotating shaft of the supporting member in the same direction that the Applicants intend and the guide roller 40 is rotated in the reverse direction that the Applicants intend, respectively. However, judging from these two rollers 30, 40 supported by one common supporting member, in Rauchfuss, the effects of the respective rollers 30, 40 offset each other and only function under limited conditions (the yarn path entering the roller 30, the yarn path coming out of the roller 40 and the rotating shaft of the supporting member are nearly in parallel among others) as shown in Figs. 1-4 of Rauchfuss.

This means that Rauchfuss works according to a principle completely different from the Applicants' principle as shown in enclosed Fig. 2. That is, in Rauchfuss, a specific yarn path is intended by the use of the two rollers and, accordingly, it cannot be obvious to produce the claimed subject matter by extracting only one guide roller by removing one (e.g. roller 40) of the two rollers supported by that supporting member.

The Applicants therefore respectfully submit that Rauchfuss fails to disclose all of the subject matter in Claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection in Claim 1 is respectfully requested.

With respect to the rejection of Claim 2, the Applicants comment as follows:

While the rejection points out that Rauchfuss discloses in Figs. 1-4 that "the rotating shaft of the supporting member crosses the original yarn path at one portion," when examining Figs. 1-4 of Rauchfuss, it can be seen that the rotating shaft of the supporting member and the web are almost in parallel to each other and appear to get together over the length-wise direction of the web.

However, the language in Claim 2 is intended to “cross at one portion” and is not one that is intended to come together “in a certain range.” Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 4-5 and 7-8 stand rejected under the 35 USC §103 over the combination of Rauchfuss with Nojiri. The Applicants respectfully submit, however, that the combination of Rauchfuss with Nojiri fails to disclose, teach or suggest the subject matter of those claims.

The rejection acknowledges that Nojiri fails to disclose the yarn path guide of Claim 1. The Applicants agree. Thus, the rejection turns to Rauchfuss to cure this deficiency. The Applicants respectfully submit, however, that Rauchfuss fails to cure that deficiency for the reasons set forth above with respect to Claim 1. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that the combination is inapplicable against Claims 4-5 and 7-8. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In light of the foregoing, the Applicants respectfully submit that the entire application is now in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



T. Daniel Christenbury
Reg. No. 31,750
Attorney for Applicants

TDC/vp
(215) 656-3381